



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Philological instruction, in the narrower sense, is properly subordinated to information historical, literary and social, in a form dictated by an enlightened desire to furnish precisely what an intelligent student would most like to have pointed out. The result is that every one of the multifarious topics touched upon is treated in the manner of a fine-line miniature dissertation, frequently illuminated or adorned by choice citations—a mode of presentation that puts ruthlessly to shame the modicum of perfunctory, scrappy annotation that used often, until recently, to hide its attenuated form between tail-piece and cover of our most available college texts.

The book, inside as well as out, is a gratification to the scholarly eye and artistic sense; hence it is with regret that the critic must call the attention of the publishers to such blemishes—fortunately few—as the casual printing of French titles in a manner obnoxious to French taste and custom: (*Montausier et son Temps*, p. lii, l. 3; *Remarques sur la langue Française*, p. lvii, l. 23; *Précieuses Ridicules, Femmes Savantes*, etc., *passim*); or even erroneous (*Histoire des Révolutions du Language en France*, twice, p. l, l. 13 and p. liii, l. 25; *Bibliographie Molièresque*, p. lvii, l. 4; *Le Moliériste*, twice, p. lvii, l. 10 and p. 310, l. 7).—On p. 275 we read in adjoining lines Duke of Enghien and Count de Mercy.—P. xvii, l. 6 we are told that the Marquis de Rambouillet died in 1652; but p. xx, l. 11, that he died in 1653.—In the punctuation of “restrictive” relative clauses the proof-reader has ignominiously tripped (“The influence of Marino, who introduced into France the affected style, which in England is called Euphuism,” p. xiv, l. 22; “the Marquis du Vigan, father of the Mlle. du Vigan, who was the object of the great Conde’s [*sic*] love,” p. xviii, l. 21).—Mere misprints are: *précisement*, p. xv, l. 15; *La Rochefoucauld*, p. xix, l. 18; *le nain de Jule* (for *Julie*), p. liii, l. 3; *automme*, p. 23, l. 20; *Victor Amé* (for *Amédée*), p. 270, l. 5; *Prince of Conde*, p. 275, l. 1. Other unimportant slips occur p. xxiii, end of line 9; p. xxv, l. 13; p. xlii, l. 10; p. 13, end of line 1; p. 44, l. 10; p. 49, end of line 24; p. 268, l. 10.—In the note to p. 3, l. 11, *vidame* is referred to Lat. *vice-dominus*; the second word in this

compound has not, as seems to be implied, the function of a genitive limiting the first; accordingly there is no reason for citing *domini* in the genitive form.—It may be worth while to remark that *Vieille rue du Temple* (p. xxxv, last line)—better *vieille rue*, etc.—is not an error but an archaism for the now almost universal *rue Vieille-du-Temple* (cf. ‘Notre-Dame de Paris,’ vol. i, p. 196, l. 3, in the Jenkins edition).

In closing, it remains only to express the wish that, in any future volumes of PROFESSOR CRANE’S series, the good things he has in store for us may be meted out with a considerably more liberal hand—less as specimens, however judiciously chosen, than as generous illustrative portions, possibly fewer in number than heretofore, of the authors studied. The publishers have right royally—that is to say, in the true American spirit—disregarded in the matter of price the consideration of average student impecuniosity. Let them, in the same spirit, invite their editor to provide for hungering and thirsting souls a feast bountiful as well as choice.

H. A. TODD.

The Gothic Handbook, being an Introduction to the History of the Goths and to the Study of the Gothic Tongue. By WALTER MARLOW RAMSAY, Rector of Wyfordby, and CLIFFORD DALHOUSIE RAMSAY, Vicar of Broughton, and Diocesan Inspector of Schools, Lichfield. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.; pp. 135.

The above-mentioned book is intended “to serve at once as an introduction to the history and literature of the Goths, as a grammar and first reading book on the language, and as a philological commentary illustrating, among other things, the relation of the language to Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek.” If the authors had succeeded in supplying our students in Germanic philology with a book that might to some extent take the place of the works of German scholars by condensing the results, they would undoubtedly have won the thanks of a large number of students. It does not take long to decide upon the merits of a work of this kind. The list of references shows at

first glance what we are to expect. SKEAT, DOUSE, G. STEPHENS, "the great Runologist," have given "their latest views," and likewise the inevitable MAX MÜLLER, who, we are sure, would be loath to assume the responsibility for half the statements here presented. But very few of the names of scholars deserving to be known to the beginner are met with; and even when such authorities are quoted our authors betray their inability to discriminate between utterances of weight and the opinions of men whose productions are suited to awaken only an antiquarian interest. It would be as impossible as it is unnecessary to point out all the errors in the pages before us, and we shall not endeavor to convince the authors by any marshalling of evidence; a remark or two upon the treatment of a portion of the subject, and a few quotations, without comment (out of many that would serve), will suffice to make it appear that this book is valueless, nay even pernicious, in the hands of the beginner—for whom it is designed.

It may be premised that the Goths are here again connected with the Getae. Chief argument: the Greek origin of the old runic alphabet, transmitted by the Getae to the Goths and thence spread to the northern Germanic tribes! LENORMANT has the honor to be placed by the side of WIMMER; the views of both are briefly rejected.—The following quotations may illustrate the authors' preparation in comparative philology:—P. 3. "The divergence of the vowel in *Gut* and *Getae* recalls that in Gothic *kuni*, *muns*, *tunth*, as compared with *γένος*, *mens*, *dens*."—P. 26. "In Gothic we have such double forms as *Gaius* and *Caius*."—P. 28. n. 1. "Thus we have *ak* for Goth. *ik* on the Vappby stone, with the older vowel as in Sk. *aham*." On page 31 Goth. *bairan bairais* etc., are compared with Sk. *bhareyam*, *bhares*, etc., and this is preceded by the remark "that the Sanskrit *e* is the equivalent of *ai*, and that Greek and Gothic *ai* had a sound very similar to it."—P. 41. "Modern German is strangely eccentric with regard to this *au* as is seen on comparing Goth. *haubiths*, *nauths*, *dauhtar*, with *haupt*, *nôth*, *töchter*."

One might expect that the more practical part of the grammar would be given satisfac-

torily and without the blunders with which the rest of the work swarms, though the specimens given above are enough to indicate the hopeless confusion of the article on Gothic sounds. Even the inflection is not stated correctly; the declension alone contains the following errors: acc. pl. *fiskaus* instead of *fiskans* (misprint?); gen. sing. *andbahteis* for *andbahtjis*, the more regular form; *laiseins* follows the *i*-declension in the dat., acc. pl., not the *o*-stems; *hairto*, as a neuter, forms the acc. sg. *hairto* not *hairtin*. The rule on p. 48 is incorrect: "stems in *ra* suppress the *s* of the nom. when *r* follows a vowel . . . but the *s* is retained when *r* follows a consonant."

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Deseret.

Undine. Eine Erzählung von FRIEDRICH BARON DE LA MOTTE FOUQUÉ. Edited with an introduction, notes and vocabulary by HANS C. G. VON JAGEMANN, New York: Henry Holt & Co.

The republication of FOUQUÉ's 'Undine'—it had appeared before in the *Unterhaltungsbibliothek* by the same firm—is a good illustration of the rapid advance instruction in modern languages has been making in this country, and of the higher claims that publishers now feel constrained to impose on the scholarship and pedagogical skill of their editors.

PROF. VON JAGEMANN's edition is excellent in every respect. The introduction contains a brief sketch of FOUQUÉ's life and literary activity, and a succinct account of the Romantic school. The editor's care in the preparation of the text and the notes leaves very little to be corrected or suggested.—On the note to p. 42, l. 25, we read: "*deren einen sie ihrem Bräutigam gab und den andern für sich behielt*"; an irregular construction; if the clause after *und* is still dependent on the relative *deren*, *andern* should not be preceded by the article," etc. We doubt whether this is correct German. *Deren* ought to be repeated before *andern* without the article or *von denen* be substituted for the partitive *deren*: *von denen sie einen—und den andern*, etc. Or, still better because more idiomatic, changing the whole construction: *während sie den*